

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : Attorney Docket No. 2006_1023A
Zhikai WANG et al. : **Confirmation No. 9015**
Serial No. 10/584,299 : Group Art Unit 1796
Filed June 23, 2006 : Examiner Michael L. Leonard
ADHESIVES : **Mail Stop: AF**

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the Advisory Action dated July 30, 2010, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the decision to not enter the response dated July 23, 2010.

The reason for denial of entry is that Formula 1A of independent claim 2 (March 18, 2010) is different from the formula of newly amended claim 17, that this was not a limitation in the previous claims and requires further search.

However, as will be seen from the Final Rejection dated May 17, 2010, claims 2-16 were objected to because Applicants corrected Formula 1A in the specification but failed to amend previous claim 2 to correspond to the newly amended specification. The Examiner further stated that to expedite prosecution, he would examine the claims as if Formula 1A was already present in previous claim 2 and the Examiner requested that Applicants amend the claims to be commensurate with the amended specification.

This is exactly what was done in the most recent amendment dated July 23, 2010 in that Formula 1A of claim 17 exactly corresponds to the previous amendment to the specification set forth in the response dated March 18, 2010. Please see page 3 of that response.

As a result of an exchange of telephone communications, the Examiner has helpfully agreed to enter the amendment of July 23, 2010 upon the filing of this request.